Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

06-518 DEC 27 2005

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No.

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

SOLANGE CHADDA,

Petitioner,

v.

RICHARD MENTZINGER JR (Representing President Georges W Bush and Condoleezza Rice),

Respondents,

ROBIN KRIZA (Representing Governor Pery)

Respondents.

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Solange Chadda
408 South 47th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19143
(215) 474-7490

Petitioner Pro se appearance

QUESTION PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. Whether the Third Circuit erred in refusing to vote in Panel rehearing regarding the soft money misused and not declared which is a violation of the Federal Election Act and also of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002 (BRCA) from Defendants President Georges W. Bush, Condoleezza Rice and Governor Pery should be reviewed in this court.

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

Pursuant to Rule 14.1 (b), the following list identifies all of the parties appearing here and before the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

The petitioners here and appellants below are:
Solange Chadda

The appellees below and respondents are President Georges W. Bush and Condelezza Rice and Governor Pery of Texas.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

QUESTIONS PRESENTED..... i.

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING..... ii.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES..... iii.

OPINIONS BELOW..... iv.

JURISDICTION..... 1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE..... 1
A. Factual Background..... 1
B. Proceedings Below..... 1

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION..... 2

1. This case raises the critically important question of how soft money used by federal candidate and their team violated the Election Act (FEC) and the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002 (BRFCA)

   A. By President Georges W. Bush

   B. By CondoleezzaRice/ Chevron/Countrywide/Sandy Shatz

   C. By a third component Governor Pery of Texas/ Tom Delay

D. The non separation of the Executive Branch and the judiciary making one branch, by the run/run by the President Georges W. Bush telling the District Court and the Appeal Court of the Third Circuit what to do to make erronned decisions, conflict of interest to avoid the scandal of the soft money not disclosed and mis appropriated, originally stolen from the sole proprietor which is the petitioner.

TABLE OF CONTENTS- Continued

The decision below creates a direct conflict between the jurisdiction and the Executive Branch.

Page

A. Manipulation of the justice system..... 3

B. Violation of the Federal Commission Act and the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002(BRCA)... 4

Immediate review is urgently needed...... 5

CONCLUSION..... 5

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES AND LEGISLATIVE MATERIAL

Page

Supreme Court, McConnell v. FEC, 124 S. Ct. 691 (203).. 2
2

Supreme Court, Dec. 10, 2003 in McConnell v. FEC
124 S. Ct. 619 (2004)..... 2

Supreme Court, since Buckley v. Valeo..... 2

CRS Isses Brief IB 87020 Campaign Financing by
Joseph E. Cantor..... 2

Section 402 (c) (1) 2 USCA $ 441 a Note (c).....
Regulations by the Federal Election Commission 2

Section 315 (a) (7) (B) of the Federal Election..... 2

Campaign Act of 1971 2U.S.C..... 2

CRS Report 96-484 by Joseph Cantor..... 2

CRS Report RC 31288 (soft money allegations of political
corruption and erron by Jack Maskell and L. Paige
Whitaker..... 2

CRS Report 97-618, legal analysis by Paige Whitaker 2

2, U.S.C. $441 b (b) (2) (A) ©)..... 2

11. C.F.R. $114, (1) (a) (2) (I) iii..... 2

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petition r[illegible]ctfully petition for a Writ of Certiorari to review the judgement of the Appeal Court of the Eastern District.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the Court of Appeal of the Third Circuit has denied the rehearing, the circuits judges didn't vote Case 05-1940, date entered September 26, 2004.

JURISDICTION

The Court of Appeal entered its judgement on July 18, 2005 pursuant to Third Circuit L.A.R. 27.4 and I.O.P. 10.6.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Factual Background:

In 2004, 204 millions 87 cents got stolen by Condoleezza Rice/Chevron/ Countrywide/Sandy Shatz and got received by President G[illegible]orges W. Bush, federal candidate and, third party got involved Governor Pery/Tom Delay in violation of the FEC and BCRA. They have stolen from the sole proprietor Solange Chadda the petitioner.

Proceedings below:

The executive branch in this case orders the judiciary branch to steal the justice in even of a scandal regarding the FEC and other violations, (telling judges what to do to steal the justice system by abuse of power).

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

INTRODUCTION

The case presents an exceptionally important question of federal law that has not been but should be settled by this Court and on which the circuits are in conflicts.

The Supreme Court upheld against facial constitutional challenge key portion of the bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002 (BCRA) prohibits national party, committee, from soliciting, receiving, directing, transferring or spending soft money; generally prohibits spending for a federal election activity by state and local party committee including an association or group of state or local candidates or local or federal candidates (bipartisan act of 2002 BCRA) campaign reform P.. 107 (155) effective Nov. 6, 2002. Also CRS issue Brief IB 87020 Campaign Financing by Joseph E. Cantor.

CRS report 96-484 political spending by organized labor and background and current issued by Joseph Cantor
CRS report RC 31288 soft money allegations of political corruption and erron by Jack Maskell and L. Paige Whitaker CRS Report 97-618. The Union dues for political purposes by Legal analysis by Paige Whiteaker
Violation of the FEC and Biopartisian Act
The candidate shall file an notification from personal funds in excess of $350,000.
Disclosure of an prohibited donations should have been disclosure as described in Section 402 (c) (1) 2 USCA $441 a Note C) regulations by the Federal Election Commission
Transfer of funds....especially stolen Section 315 (a) (7) (B) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 USC)

Expenditures made by any person (other than a candidate in cooperation with the candidate or at the request shall be considered to be contribution made to such party committee.
Each report by a political committee under subparagraph (A) of Section 323 (b) (2) (A) and (B).

Neither President Georges W. Bush reported it
Neither Condoleezza Rice reported it
Neither Governor Pery reported it
Neither Tom Delay reported it
Neither the Republican Party reported it

Violations by these appellees of abuse of power of disclosure, of fraud, of fee and bipartisan act, and obstruction of justice.

Details

When the petitioner called on Chevron, an employee of Chevron will testify if the case is not fair and reversed so that justice can be heard. He will testify about the 204.87c millions stolen from the sole proprietor Solange Chadda for her oil rights and royalties. Regarding the perjury of Condoleczza Rice and her friend from Countrywide, Sandy Shatz, used stolen money and washed the money through the Campaign of President Georges W. Bush , and the Governor of Texas and Tom Delay to gain some seats in the house. They all knew that the money was stolen. At the time Condoleezza Rice was on the California Board of Chevron, but they decided to be above the law and abuse the power and steal the system by obstruction of justice in all its means.

President Georges W. Bush didn't have to accept the money and wash it through the different steps without the disclosure. He

Knew that the 204 millions 87 cents were stolen from the petitioner Solange Chadda from her oil revenues, but he thought that through, the Roman Empire, the administration could get away with it. Tom Delay got already indicted for the misuse of the funds. The funds, some of these funds are part of the 204 millions 87 cents Tom Delay used some of the money, a small portion of it to buy seats in the house which is illegal and laundering operation which is double illegal.

House Majority Leader Tom Delay indicted again, second charges allege money laundering Texas v. Colyandro, et al. U. S. House Majority Leader Tom Delay is indicted for the second time in a week by a Texas grand jury. The new charges allege money laundering while his original indictment accused him of criminal conspiracy charges relating to a campaign finance probe (Oct. 3, 2005). Tom Delay knew very well as well than Condoleezza Rice, and Countrywide which is a Texas based corporation.

Argument

Violation of the FEC and the BRCA and the abuse of power and obstruction of justice telling the district court what to rule and telling the Third Circuit Court of Appeals what to do as well is obstruction of justice which needs immediate attention and reversed and have a fair trial otherwise it will be just and fair that the judiciary committee opened an investigation.

IMMEDIATE REVIEW IS URGENTLY NEEDED

This Court's review is urgently needed. For Petitioner her oil revenues needed to be rerestituted. The respondents stole her monies and washed it into the campaign, violating all the acts of the campaigns.. And obstructing justice as well.
The executive branch cannot tell the judiciary branch what to do, there is a conflict there.

And already the Supreme Court upheld the prohibitions that respondents have committed.
The Respondents have already violated the Supreme Court's ruling McConnell v. FEC 124.S.Ct. 619 (2003)

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the petitioner represents that the petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

December 22, 2005

Respectfully submitted this day of December 2005

Solange Chadda
408 S. 47th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19143
Petitioner pro se

DECLARATION

I, Solange Chadda petitioner pro se does solemnly affirm that as a petitioner pro se, I will conduct myself upright and according to the law and that I will support the Constitution of the United States.
December 22, 2005
Petitioner, prose

No._____

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

SOLANGE CHADDA

Petitioner,

v.

RICHARD MENTZINGER JR. (representing President Georges W. Bush and Condoleezza Rice),

Respondents,

&

ROBIN KRIZA (representing the Governor of Texas),

Respondents.

APPENDIX

App. 1

RECORDS FROM THE THIRD CIRCUIT

Judgement

Opinion for panel rehearing

App. 2

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

Case No: 05-1940

SOLANGE CHADDA,
I REPRESENT "WE THE PEOPLE"

v.

ED GILLESPIE; DICK CHENEY/BUSH 2004 CAMPAIGN:
CONDOLEEZZA RICE; GEORGE W. BUSH;
RICK PERRY, THE GOVERNOR OF TEXAS

Solange Chadda,
Appellant

SUR PETITION FOR PANEL REHEARING

Present: ROTH, BARRY, and SMITH, Circuit Judges

The petition for rehearing filed by appellant in the above-entitled case

having been submitted to the judges who participated in the decision of

this Court, and no judge who concurred in the decision having asked for

rehearing, and none of the members of the panel having voted for rehearing, the petition for rehearing is denied.

BY THE COURT:

/s/D. Brook Smith
Circuit Judge

DATED: September 26, 2005
CLW/cc: Ms. Solange Chadda
Richard Mentzinger, Esq
Robin M. Kriza, Esq.

App. 4

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

Case No: 05-1940

SOLANGE CHADDA,
I REPRESENT "WE THE PEOPLE"

v.

ED GILLESPIE; DICK CHENEY/BUSH 2004 CAMPAIGN;
CONDOLEEZZA RICE; GEORGE W. BUSH;
RICK PERY, THE GOVERNOR OF TEXAS

Solange Chadda,
Appellant

On Appeal from the United States District Court
For the Eastern District of Pennsylvania
(D.C. Civ. No. 04-CV-4207
District Judge: Honorable R. Barclay Surrick

Submitted Under Third Circuit L.A.R. 27.4 and I.O.P. 10.6
May 5, 2005
Before: ROTH, BARRY and SMITH, Circuit Judges

JUDGEMENT

This cause came on to be heard on the record from the

United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and was submitted pursuant to Third Circuit L.A.R.27.4 and I.O.P. 10.6. On consideration whereof, it is now here

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED by this Court that the judgement of the District Court entered February 28, 2005 be and the same is hereby affirmed. All of the above in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

ATTEST:

Chief Deputy Clerk

DATED: July 18, 2005

Certified as a true copy and issued in lieu of a formal mandate on 10/14/05

Teste:
Clerk, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit

DPS-225 NOT PRESENDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

NO. 05-1940

SOLANGE CHADDA
I REPRESENT "WE THE PEOPLE,"

v.

ED GILLEPSIE; DICK CHENEY/BUSH 2004 CAMPAIGN; CONDOLEZZA RICE; GEORGE W. BUSH; RICK PERRY, THE GOVERNOR OF TEXAS

Solange Chadda,
Appellant

On Appeal From the United States District Court
For the Eastern District of Pennsylvania
(D.C. Civ. No. 04-cv-4207)
District Judge: Honorable R. Barclay Surrick

Submitted Under Third Circuit L.A.R. 27.4 and I.O.P. 10.6
May 5, 2005

Before: ROTH, BARRY and SMITH, Circuit Judges

(Filed: July 18, 2005)

OPINION

PER CURIAM

Solange Chadda appeals from a District Court order granting Appellees' motions to dismiss her complaint. Appellees move this Court to summarily affirm the District Court's order. Because no substantial question is presented, we will grant Appellees' motions and affirm the order of the District Court. L.A.R. 27.4.

On September 3, 2004, Chadda filed a complaint which is largely unintelligible. Even after considering the complaint and two amended versions, the District Court could not discern the basis of the suit. In dismissing for lack of standing, failure to state a claim, and other reasons, it stated the filings "consist of what appears to be paranoid, delusional rantings against the Defendants and the current administration." Chadda v. Gillespie, No. 04-4207, slip op. At 2 (E.D. Pa. Feb. 24, 2005). Chadda appealed and the Appellees mov ed for summary affirmance. Chadda responded. The motions are ripe for review.

We must first address whether Chadda has standing to sue. See Storino v. Borough of Point Pleasant Beach, 322 F. 3d 293,

296 (3d Cir. 2003). To have standing a plaintiff must establish (1) an injury in fact- i.e. , an invasion that is "concrete and particularized,... not hypothetical and conjectural"; (2) "a causal connection between the injury and conduct complained of "; and (3) the injury must be redressable. Id. (Citations omitted).

We agree with the District Court that Chadda lacks standing. We can piece together no more than a conjectural abstract injury from Chadda's pleadings. It appears that Chadda believes the current administration stole her land and mineral rights, but she identified no specific asset or incident. She also presents a vague First Amendment claim, but it is left to the imagination how her rights were violated. Accordingly, her abstract and hypothetical injuries cannot amount to an injury in fact.

For the foregoing reasons, no substantial question is presented and we will grant Appellees' motions and affirm the District Court's order dismissing the complaint.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

SOLANGE CHADDA	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
V.	:	
	:	NO. 04-CV-4207
ED GILLESPIE, ET AL	:	

MEMORANDUM & ORDER

SURRICK J. FEBRUARY 24, 2005

Presently before the Court are Defendant Rick Perry's Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No.6) and Defendants Condolezza Rice, Ed Gillespie and George W. Bush's Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 12). For the following reasons, we will grant Defendants' Motions and dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint.

Plaintiff filed a Complaint against Condolezza Rice, George W. Bush, Ed Gillespie, the "Chesney/Bush" 2004 Campaign and Rick Perry, Governor of Texas. (Doc. No. 1.) Defendants filed a

Motion to Dismiss pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) (Doc. No. 6 at 2; Doc. No. 12 at 2.) A court may grant a Rule 12(b)(6) motion where the plaintiff fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. "A motion to dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6)may be granted only if, accepting all well-pleaded allegations in the complaint as true, and viewing them in the light most favorable to plaintiff, plaintiff is not entitled to relief. *In re Burlington Coat Factory Sex Litig.*, 114F.3d 1410, 1420 (3d Cir. 1997). The Third Circuit has stated that "we need not accept as true unsupported conclusions and unwarranted inferences." *City of Pittsburgh v. West Penn Power Co.*, 147 E. 3d 256, 263 n. 13 (3d Circ. 1998) (quoting *Schuylkill Energy Res., Inc. V. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co.*, 113F3d 405, 417 (3d Cir. 1997).

Plaintiff has filed her Complaint pro so. Accordingly, we must con_____her Complaint liberally. *Homes v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). However, even a pro se Plaintiff must make specific allegations, not "(v)ague and conclusory statements," and comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in order to state

a claim. See *Carpenter v. Johnson*, No. 01-CV 1828, 2001 WL 1167500, at *2 (E.D. Pa. Sept. 14, 2001).

Plaintiff's Complaint and her two Amended Complaints are essentially incomprehensible. (Doc. Nos. 1, 8, 14) [1] She does not state any specific claim against Defendants or any legal basis for any claim. Rather, Plaintiff's Complaint and Amended Complaints consist of what appears to be paranoid, delusional rantings against the Defendants and the current administration. For example, Plaintiff contends that after her common-law husband visited Germany, "Plaintiff received cranky phone calls from Arlington, Virginia coming directly From the CIA headquarters...Apparently Again, Georges [sic] W. Bush and Condelezza [sic] Rice have given order to tape." (Doc. No. at unnumbered 2). She adds that Plaintiff received also threats... and the day that Richard[sic] was coming home, something Happened even further, somebody shot at my dog[sic] in my garden, [sic] my dog got so scared..." *Id.* at unnumbered 3.) Plaintiff's most specific allegations do not

1 Plaintiff has filed a Complaint (Doc. No.) and two Amended Complaints (Doc. Nos. 8.14. She did not request leave to file the Amended Compaints. However, because Plaintiff is pro se, we willconsider her Complaint and her Amended Complaints.

even involve Defendants. For example, she alleges that

> [m]y civil rights got violated again when I went to the grocery store, I Got searched and one day I bought a magazine of us magazine saying The economy sucks, they tired up the front page and threw my strawberries on the counter and said pick it up you paid for it (case pending against The claims of grocery financed by bush money)

(Doc. No. 1 at unnumbered 7) She adds, [b]ut it doesn't stop here[sic] I have to jump out from a false cab, attemptative [sic] of kidnaping and I heard from friends that the administration has contacted to let their message pass through, if I continue to speak to democrats and John Kerry people they will kidnap me and torture me this is ridiculous.

(Id). Clearly, Plaintiff has failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

Defendants have also responded to Plaintiff's bizarre filings by raising the issues of standing, lack of proper service, lack of

personal jurisdiction, and the doctrine of sovereign immunity. We will address these issues. Defendants contend that Plaintiff lacks standing to bring claims against them. (Doc. No. 12 at 5) "Standing is a threshold jurisdictional requirement, derived from the case or controversy' language of Article III of the Constitution. Plaintiffs must have standing at all stags of the litigation..." *Pub. Interest Research Group of N.J., Inc. V Magnesium Elektron, Inc.,* 123 F 3d 111, 118 (3d Cir. 1997) (citations omitted). To establish the constitutional minimum requirements for standing, a plaintiff must demonstrate that : (1) she suffered an injury in fact which is (a) concrete and particularized and (b) actual or imminent, not conjectural or hypothetical; (2) there must be a causal complaint between the injury and the conduct complained of, and (3) it must be likely as opposed to speculative that the injury will be redressed by a favorable decision. *Luyan v. Defenders of Wildlife,* 504 U.S. 555, 560-61 (1992). Defendants assert that Plaintiff's Complaint fails to satisfy these standing requirements. Defendants are correct.

From what we can discern from Plaintiff's rambling Complaint, the injuries she alleges are not particularized, but abstract and hypothetical. She does not demonstrate any injury in fact or any causal connection between Defendants' actions and her injuries. Plaintiff does not establish standing.

Defendants Bush and Rice also assert that Plaintiff's claims against them in their official capacity are barred by the doctrine of sovereign immunity. (Doc. No. 12 at 7). The doctrine of sovereign immunity provides that a plaintiff cannot bring a suit against the United States, including a suit for money damages,[2] except to the extent that the United States has expressly consented to be sued. *United States v. Mitchell*, 445 U.S. 535, 538 (1980). "A waiver of sovereign immunity cannot be implied but must be unequivocally expressed." *United States v. King* 395 U.S. 1,4

2Plaintiff appears to seek damages as follows:

just the money stolen from me 204 millions 87 cents, all the money I've been rackitiered these past 4 years which an another 450,000 and some punitive damages for the pain and sufferance that they made me passed through, of course I survived an another 1 million a total of $205 millions 450 and 87 cents + (the money I invested in Texas, through advertising etc... I brough income to Texas an another 6 millions and half.

(Doc. No. 1 at 3. (Original spelling and grammar.)

(1969). Plaintiff does not demonstrate a waiver of sovereign immunity which would permit suit against Defendants Bush and Rice in the official capacities.

Finally, Defendants Bush and Rice assert that Plaintiff failed to properly serve them. (Doc. No. 12 at 7.) In Plaintiff's Certification of Mailing, she states that she mailed the Complaint by regular mail to "Condelezza rice/georges w. bush." (Doc. No. 1 at 10.) Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4 (I) provides that Service upon the United States may be effected:

> (A) by delivering a copy of the summons and complaint to the United States attorney for the district in which the action is brought or to an assistant United States attorney or clerical employee designated by the United States attorney in a writing filed with the clerk of the court of by sending a copy of the summons and of the complaint by registered or certified mail addressed to the civil process clerk at the office of the United States attorney and (B) by also sending a copy of the summons and the complaint by registered or certified mail to the Attorney General of the United States.

Fed. R. Civ. P.4 (i)(1). Service upon an officer or agency of the United States "sued only in an official capacity...is effected by

serving the United States in the manner prescribed by Rule 4 (j)(1) and by also sending a copy of the summons and complaint by registered or certified mail to the officer, employee, agency or corporation." Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (I) (2)(A). Plaintiff has not properly served defendants Bush and Rice.

Defendants Rick Perry also asserts that Plaintiff has no personal jurisdiction over him. (Doc. No. 6 at 3.) Defendants Perry asserts that he is a non-resident and does not have sufficient contacts with Pennsylvania to satisfy jurisdictional requirements. (*Id.* At 4.) He contends that jurisdiction is not proper because Defendant does not have any contact with Pennsylvania *Id.* At 5.) Defendant Perry also asserts that all of the acts complained of by the Plaintiff regarding Perry result from actions taken by Plaintiff in Pennsylvania and do not involve any action taken by Perry in Pennsylvania. In *International Shoe Co. V. Washington,* 326U.S. 310, 316 (1954), the Supreme Court held that a non-resident defendant must have "purposely availed" itself of the benefits and protevcctins of the forum state by having established minimum

contacts such that the "maintenance of the suit does not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice" *Id.* (citations omitted). Those "minimum contacts" must be the basis for the plaintiff's claim *Helicopteros Nacionales De Columbia v. Hall*, 466 U.S. 408, 414 (1984). "A relationship a Among the defendant, the forum, and the litigations the essential foundation of in personam jurisdiction." *Id.* (citation omitted). *Id.* (Citation omitted). Under the "minimum contacts" requirement set out in *International Shoe*, personal jurisdiction may be established by contacts between a defendant and forum state that have been "continuous and systematic" or through "the commission of some single or occasional acts...in a state sufficient to impose an obligation or liability." *International Shoe Co.*, 326 U.S. at 317-18. We discern no contacts between Defendant Perry and Pennsylvania.

For the foregoing reasons, we grant Defendants' Motions to Dismiss and dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint.

An appropriate Order follows:

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

SOLANGE CHADDA	:	
	:	CIVIL ACTION
v.	:	
	:	NO. 04-CV-4207
ED GILLESPIE, ET AL.	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 24th daty of February, 2005, upon consideration of Defendant Rick Perry's Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 6); (2) Plaintiff Solange Chadda's Motion to Strike in response

(Doc. No. 10); (3) Defendants Condoleezza Rice and George W. Bush's Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 12); and (4) Planitiff's Motion to Strike in response (Doc. No. 13), it is ORDERED as follows:

(1) Defendant Rick Perry's Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 6) is GRANTED;

(2) Defendants Condoleezza Rice and George W. Bush's

Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 12) is GRANTED;

(3) Plaintiff's Complaint (Doc. No. 1) and Plaintiff's two Amended

Complaints (Doc. Nos. 8, 14) are DISMISSED.

The Clerk is directed to mark this case closed.

BY THE COURT:

_____

R. Barclay Surrick, Judge

CASE STATUS AS OF SEPTEMBER 26, 2005

Plaintiff	United State Court of Appeals Third Circuit Docket No.	Disposition
Solange Chadda v. Ed Gillespsie, Condelezza Rice, Pr. Georges W. Bush et al	Case No. 05-1940	Petition for rehearing is denied
Solange Chadda v. Ed Gillespsie, Condelezza Rice, Pr. Georges W. Bush et al	Case No. 05-1940	Appeal dismissed
Solange Chadda v. Ed Gillespsie, et al	Case No. 04-4207	Complaints Dismissed
Solange Chadda v. Ed Gillespsie et al	Case No. 04-4207	Opinion
Solange Chadda v. Ed Gillespsie, et al	Case No. 04-CV-4207	Memorandum & Order
Solange Chadda v. Ed Gillespsie, et al	Case No. 04-CV-4207	Complaints Dismissed

31

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
MAR 15 2007
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 06-518

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

SOLANGE CHADDA,

Petitioner,

v.

RICHARD MENTZINGER JR (Representing President Georges W Bush and Condoleezza Rice),

Respondents,

ROBIN KRIZA (Representing Governor Pery)

Respondents.

On Petition for a Rehearing to the Supreme Court of the United States

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Solange Chadda
408 South 47th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19143
(215) 474-1722

Petitioner Pro se appearance

QUESTION PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. Whether the Third Circuit erred in refusing to vote in Panel rehearing regarding the soft money misused and not declared which is a violation of the Federal Election Act and also of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002 (BRCA) from Defendants President Georges W. Bush, Condoleezza Rice and Governor Pery should be reviewed in this court.

In the case U.S. Supreme Court, Nixon v. United States, 506. U.S. 224 (1993). The President George W. Bush can be impeached, the manipulation of the Judiciary System, through the Lower Courts and higher Court, pose a conflict of interest between the Legislative Power and the Executive Power and Judiciary Power, we have grounds of abuse of power and grounds for impeachment process. "As a rule the Constitution speaks in general terms leaving Congress to deal with subsidiary matters of detail as the public interests and changing conditions may require..." Dillion v. Gloss 246 U.S. 368, 376 (1921)

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

Pursuant to Rule 14.1 (b), the following list identifies all of the parties appearing here and before the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

The petitioners here and appellants below are:
Solange Chadda

The appellees below and respondents are President Georges W. Bush and Condelezza Rice and Governor Pery of Texas.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

QUESTIONS PRESENTED..... i.

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING..... ii.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES..... iii.

OPINIONS BELOW..... iv.

JURISDICTION..... 1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE..... 1
A. Factual Background..... 1
B. Proceedings Below..... 1

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION..... 2

1. This case raises the critically important question of how soft money used by federal candidate and their team violated the Election Act (FEC) and the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002 (BRFCA)

   A. By President Georges W. Bush

   B. By CondoleezzaRice/ Chevron/Countrywide/Sandy Shats

   C. By a third component Governor Pery of Texas/ Tom Delay

D. The non separation of the Executive Branch and the judiciary making one branch, by the run/run by the President Georges W. Bush telling the District Court and the Appeal Court of the Third Circuit what to do to make erronned decisions, conflict of interest to avoid the scandal of the soft money not disclosed and mis appropriated, originally stolen from the sole proprietor which is the petitioner.

TABLE OF CONTENTS- Continued

The decision below creates a direct conflict between the jurisdiction and the Executive Branch.

Page

A. Manipulation of the justice system..... 3

B. Violation of the Federal Commission Act and the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002(BRCA)... 4

Immediate review is urgently needed...... 5

CONCLUSION..... 5

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES AND LEGISLATIVE MATERIAL

Page

Supreme Court, McConnell v. FEC, 124 S. Ct. 691 (203).. 2
2

Supreme Court, Dec. 10, 2003 in McConnell v. FEC
124 S. Ct. 619 (2004)..... 2

Supreme Court, since Buckley v. Valeo..... 2

CRS Isses Brief IB 87020 Campaign Financing by
Joseph E. Cantor..... 2

Section 402 (c) (1) 2 USCA $ 441 a Note (c).....

Regulations by the Federal Election Commission 2

Section 315 (a) (7) (B) of the Federal Election..... 2

Campaign Act of 1971 2U.S.C..... 2

CRS Report 96-484 by Joseph Cantor..... 2

CRS Report RC 31288 (soft money allegations of political
corruption and erron by Jack Maskell and L. Paige
Whitaker..... 2

CRS Report 97-618, legal analysis by Paige Whitaker 2

2, U.S.C. $441 b (b) (2) (A) ©)..... 2

11. C.F.R. $114, (1) (a) (2) (I) iii..... 2

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Petition respectfully petition for Rehearing to review the judgement of the Appeal Court of the Eastern District and the denial of the Petition for the Writ of Certiorari.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the Court of Appeal of the Third Circuit has denied the rehearing, the circuits judges didn't vote Case 05-1940, date entered September 26, 2004.

JURISDICTION

The Court of Appeal entered its judgement on July 18, 2005 pursuant to Third Circuit L.A.R. 27.4 and I.O.P. 10.6.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Factual Background:
In 2004, 204 millions 87 cents got stolen by Condoleezza Rice/Chevron/ Countrywide/Sandy Shatz and got received by President Georges W. Bush, federal candidate and, third party got involved Governor Pery/Tom Delay in violation of the FEC and BCRA. They have stolen from the sole proprietor Solange Chadda the petitioner.

Proceedings below:
The executive branch in this case orders the judiciary branch to steal the justice in even of a scandal regarding the FEC and other violations, (telling judges what to do to steal the justice system by abuse of power).

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

INTRODUCTION

The case presents an exceptionally important question of federal law that has not been but should be settled by this Court and on which the circuits are in conflicts.

The Supreme Court upheld against facial constitutional challenge key portion of the bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002 (BCRA) prohibits national party, committee, from soliciting, receiving, directing, transferring or spending soft money; generally prohibits spending for a federal election activity by state and local party committee including an association or group of state or local candidates or local or federal candidates (bipartisan act of 2002 BCRA) campaign reform P.. 107 (155) effective Nov. 6, 2002. Also CRS issue Brief IB 87020 Campaign Financing by Joseph E. Cantor.

CRS report 96-484 political spending by organized labor and background and current issued by Joseph Cantor
CRS report RC 31288 soft money allegations of political corruption and erron by Jack Maskell and L. Paige Whitaker CRS Report 97-618. The Union dues for political purposes by Legal analysis by Paige Whiteaker
Violation of the FEC and Biopartisian Act
The candidate shall file an notification from personal funds in excess of $350,000.
Disclosure of an prohibited donations should have been disclosure as described in Section 402 (c) (1) 2 USCA $441 a Note C) regulations by the Federal Election Commission
Transfer of funds....especially stolen Section 315 (a) (7) (B) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 USC)

Expenditures made by any person (other than a candidate in cooperation with the candidate or at the request shall be considered to be contribution made to such party committee.
Each report by a political committee under subparagraph (A) of Section 323 (b) (2) (A) and (B).

Neither President Georges W. Bush reported it
Neither Condoleezza Rice reported it
Neither Governor Pery reported it
Neither Tom Delay reported it
Neither the Republican Party reported it

Violations by these appellees of abuse of power of disclosure, of fraud, of fee and bipartisan act, and obstruction of justice.

Details

When the petitioner called on Chevron, an employee of Chevron will testify if the case is not fair and reversed so that justice can be heard. He will testify about the 204.87c millions stolen from the sole proprietor Solange Chadda for her oil rights and royalties. Regarding the perjury of Condoleezza Rice and her friend from Countrywide, Sandy Shatz, used stolen money and washed the money through the Campaign of President Georges W. Bush , and the Governor of Texas and Tom Delay to gain some seats in the house. They all knew that the money was stolen. At the time Condoleezza Rice was on the California Board of Chevron, but they decided to be above the law and abuse the power and steal the system by obstruction of justice in all its means.

President Georges W. Bush didn't have to accept the money and wash it through the different steps without the disclosure. He

Knew that the 204 millions 87 cents were stolen from the petitioner Solange Chadda from her oil revenues, but he thought that through, the Roman Empire, the administration could get away with it. Tom Delay got already indicted for the misuse of the funds. The funds, some of these funds are part of the 204 millions 87 cents Tom Delay used some of the money, a small portion of it to buy seats in the house which is illegal and laundering operation which is double illegal.

House Majority Leader Tom Delay indicted again, second charges allege money laundering Texas v. Colyandro, et al. U. S. House Majority Leader Tom Delay is indicted for the second time in a week by a Texas grand jury. The new charges allege money laundering while his original indictment accused him of criminal conspiracy charges relating to a campaign finance probe (Oct. 3, 2005). Tom Delay knew very well as well than Condoleezza Rice, and Countrywide which is a Texas based corporation.

Argument

Violation of the FEC and the BRCA and the abuse of power and obstruction of justice telling the district court what to rule and telling the Third Circuit Court of Appeals what to do as well is obstruction of justice which needs immediate attention and reversed and have a fair trial otherwise it will be just and fair that the judiciary committee opened an investigation.

The behavior of Condelezza Rice and The President Georges W. Bush is in violation of the oath they took in front of the American people. They abused their power and made one sole power between all the respective branches and lied to the American people. They

didn't declare the stolen money - the money they stole from the pipelines of the petitioner. At that time Condelezza Rice was on Board of Chevron California and being appointed by the President, she decided to wash out the 204 millions 87 and give to the President. The President should have at that time disclosed the stolen money but he didn't. He thought that the Executive Power will rule over all the Houses and Branches. Today, the Democrats have the majority of the House and Senate and should put the justice on the right track. More generally, in colonial governments and state legislatures, contemnors appeared before committees to answer the charges against them. See Gropi v. Leslie, 404 U.S. 495, 501 (1972) Federal Courts likewise had appointed special masters and other fact finders (from the commencement of our Government. Ex-Parte Peterson, 253, U.S. 300, 312 (1920). Particularly in light of the Constitution's grant to each house of the power to determine the rules of its proceeding see Art 1.5, c12, the Existence of Legislative. The President committed an act of abuse of power and more and should come clean, restitute the money of the pipelines, committed on the first place by Condelezza Rice and apologize to Congress and the Senate and the Judiciary Committee. The political question doctrine is essentially a function of the separations of power from inappropriate interference in thge business of the other branches of government. United States 506 U.S. 224, 253, and see Goldwater v. Carter 444 U.S. 996, 1000 (1979). The Petition for rehearing should be granted, this case should be heard.

IMMEDIATE REVIEW IS URGENTLY NEEDED

This Court's review is urgently needed. For Petitioner her oil revenues needed to be rerestituted. The respondents stole her monies and washed it into the campaign, violating all the acts of the campaigns.. And obstructing justice as well.
The executive branch cannot tell the judiciary branch what to do, there is a conflict there.

And already the Supreme Court upheld the prohibitions that respondents have committed.
The Respondents have already violated the Supreme Court's ruling McConnell v. FEC 124.S.Ct. 619 (2003)

CONCLUSION

The Petition for rehearing should be granted and this Case should be heard and the Supreme Court of the United States should force the parties to answer. So far President Georges W. Bush ,Condelezza Rice and Governor of Texas decided to answer. The Supreme Court of the United State has the Authority to force the defendants to answer and let the truth come out without any Obstruction of Justice. Everybody is presumed innocent. To be guilty as charged they have to answer all the questions in the matter for their defense. The Petition for Rehearing should be granted. This Case should be heard. This case is in the interest of justice and the American people.

For the foregoing reasons, the petitioner represents that the petition for Rehearing should be granted.

December 22, 2005

Respectfully submitted this day of December 2005

Solange Chadda
408 S. 47th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19143
Petitioner pro se

DECLARATION

I, Solange Chadda petitioner pro se does solemnly affirm that as a petitioner pro se, I will conduct myself upright and according to the law and that I will support the Constitution of the United States.
December 22, 2005
Petitioner, prose

No. 06-518

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

SOLANGE CHADDA

Petitioner,

v.

RICHARD MENTZINGER JR. (representing President Georges W. Bush and Condoleezza Rice),

Respondents,

&

ROBIN KRIZA (representing the Governor of Texas),

Respondents.

APPENDIX

App. 1

RECORDS FROM THE THIRD CIRCUIT

Judgement

Opinion for panel rehearing

App. 2

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

Case No: 05-1940

SOLANGE CHADDA,
I REPRESENT "WE THE PEOPLE"

v.

ED GILLESPIE; DICK CHENEY/BUSH 2004 CAMPAIGN:
CONDOLEEZZA RICE; GEORGE W. BUSH;
RICK PERRY, THE GOVERNOR OF TEXAS

Solange Chadda,
Appellant

SUR PETITION FOR PANEL REHEARING

Present: ROTH, BARRY, and SMITH, Circuit Judges

The petition for rehearing filed by appellant in the above-entitled case having been submitted to the judges who participated in the decision of this Court, and no judge who concurred in the decision

asked for rehearing, and none of the members of the panel having voted for rehearing, the petition for rehearing is denied.

BY THE COURT:

/s/D. Brook Smith
Circuit Judge

DATED: September 26, 2005
CLW/cc: Ms. Solange Chadda
Richard Mentzinger, Esq
Robin M. Kriza, Esq.

App. 4

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

Case No: 05-1940

SOLANGE CHADDA,
I REPRESENT "WE THE PEOPLE"

v.

ED GILLESPIE; DICK CHENEY/BUSH 2004 CAMPAIGN;
CONDOLEEZZA RICE; GEORGE W. BUSH;
RICK PERY, THE GOVERNOR OF TEXAS

Solange Chadda,
Appellant

On Appeal from the United States District Court
For the Eastern District of Pennsylvania
(D.C. Civ. No. 04-CV-4207
District Judge: Honorable R. Barclay Surrick

Submitted Under Third Circuit L.A.R. 27.4 and I.O.P. 10.6
May 5, 2005
Before: ROTH, BARRY and SMITH, Circuit Judges

JUDGEMENT

This cause came on to be heard on the record from the

United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and was submitted pursuant to Third Circuit L.A.R.27.4 and I.O.P. 10.6. On consideration whereof, it is now here

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED by this Court that the judgement of the District Court entered February 28, 2005 be and the same is hereby affirmed. All of the above in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

ATTEST:

Chief Deputy Clerk

DATED: July 18, 2005

Certified as a true copy and issued in lieu of a formal mandate on 10/14/05

Teste:
Clerk, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit

DPS-225 NOT PRESENDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

NO. 05-1940

SOLANGE CHADDA
I REPRESENT "WE THE PEOPLE,"

v.

ED GILLEPSIE; DICK CHENEY/BUSH 2004 CAMPAIGN; CONDOLEZZA RICE; GEORGE W. BUSH; RICK PERRY, THE GOVERNOR OF TEXAS

Solange Chadda,
Appellant

On Appeal From the United States District Court
For the Eastern District of Pennsylvania
(D.C. Civ. No. 04-cv-4207)
District Judge: Honorable R. Barclay Surrick

Submitted Under Third Circuit L.A.R. 27.4 and I.O.P. 10.6
May 5, 2005

Before: ROTH, BARRY and SMITH, Circuit Judges

(Filed: July 18, 2005)

OPINION

PER CURIAM

Solange Chadda appeals from a District Court order granting Appellees' motions to dismiss her complaint. Appellees move this Court to summarily affirm the District Court's order. Because no substantial question is presented, we will grant Appellees' motions and affirm the order of the District Court. L.A.R. 27.4.

On September 3, 2004, Chadda filed a complaint which is largely unintelligible. Even after considering the complaint and two amended versions, the District Court could not discern the basis of the suit. In dismissing for lack of standing, failure to state a claim, and other reasons, it stated the filings "consist of what appears to be paranoid, delusional rantings against the Defendants and the current administration." Chadda v. Gillespie, No. 04-4207, slip op. At 2 (E.D. Pa. Feb. 24, 2005). Chadda appealed and the Appellees mov ed for summary affirmance. Chadda responded. The motions are ripe for review.

We must first address whether Chadda has standing to sue. See Storino v. Borough of Point Pleasant Beach, 322 F. 3d 293,

296 (3d Cir. 2003). To have standing a plaintiff must establish (1) an injury in fact- i.e. , an invasion that is "concrete and particularized,... not hypothetical and conjectural"; (2) "a causal connection between the injury and conduct complained of"; and (3) the injury must be redressable. Id. (Citations omitted).

We agree with the District Court that Chadda lacks standing. We can piece together no more than a conjectural abstract injury from Chadda's pleadings. It appears that Chadda believes the current administration stole her land and mineral rights, but she identified no specific asset or incident. She also presents a vague First Amendment claim, but it is left to the imagination how her rights were violated. Accordingly, her abstract and hypothetical injuries cannot amount to an injury in fact.

For the foregoing reasons, no substantial question is presented and we will grant Appellees' motions and affirm the District Court's order dismissing the complaint.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

SOLANGE CHADDA	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
V.	:	
	:	NO. 04-CV-4207
ED GILLESPIE, ET AL	:	

MEMORANDUM & ORDER

SURRICK J. FEBRUARY 24, 2005

Presently before the Court are Defendant Rick Perry's Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No.6) and Defendants Condolezza Rice, Ed Gillespie and George W. Bush's Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 12). For the following reasons, we will grant Defendants' Motions and dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint.

Plaintiff filed a Complaint against Condolezza Rice, George W. Bush, Ed Gillespie, the "Chesney/Bush" 2004 Campaign and Rick Perry, Governor of Texas. (Doc. No. 1.) Defendants filed a

Motion to Dismiss pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) (Doc. No. 6 at 2; Doc. No. 12 at 2.) A court may grant a Rule 12(b)(6) motion where the plaintiff fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. "A motion to dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6)may be granted only if, accepting all well-pleaded allegations in the complaint as true, and viewing them in the light most favorable to plaintiff, plaintiff is not entitled to relief. *In re Burlington Coat Factory Sex Litig.*, 114F.3d 1410, 1420 (3d Cir. 1997). The Third Circuit has stated that "we need not accept as true unsupported conclusions and unwarranted inferences." *City of Pittsburgh v. West Penn Power Co.*, 147 E. 3d 256, 263 n. 13 (3d Circ. 1998) (quoting *Schuylkill Energy Res., Inc. V. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co.*, 113F3d 405, 417 (3d Cir. 1997).

Plaintiff has filed her Complaint pro so. Accordingly, we must con_____her Complaint liberally. *Homes v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). However, even a pro se Plaintiff must make specific allegations, not "(v)ague and conclusory statements," and comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in order to state

a claim. See *Carpenter v. Johnson*, No. 01-CV 1828, 2001 WL 1167500, at *2 (E.D. Pa. Sept. 14, 2001).

Plaintiff's Complaint and her two Amended Complaints are essentially incomprehensible. (Doc. Nos. 1, 8, 14) [1] She does not state any specific claim against Defendants or any legal basis for any claim. Rather, Plaintiff's Complaint and Amended Complaints consist of what appears to be paranoid, delusional rantings against the Defendants and the current administration. For example, Plaintiff contends that after her common-law husband visited Germany, "Plaintiff received cranky phone calls from Arlington, Virginia coming directly From the CIA headquarters...Apparently Again, Georges [sic] W. Bush and Condelezza [sic] Rice have given order to tape." (Doc. No. at unnumbered 2). She adds that Plaintiff received also threats... and the day that Richard[sic] was coming home, something Happened even further, somebody shot at my dog[sic] in my garden, [sic] my dog got so scared..." *Id.* at unnumbered 3.) Plaintiff's most specific allegations do not

1 Plaintiff has filed a Complaint (Doc. No.) and two Amended Complaints (Doc. Nos. 8.14. She did not request leave to file the Amended Compaints. However, because Plaintiff is pro se, we willconsider her Complaint and her Amended Complaints.

even involve Defendants. For example, she alleges that

> [m]y civil rights got violated again when I went to the grocery store, I Got searched and one day I bought a magazine of us magazine saying The economy sucks, they tired up the front page and threw my strawberries on the counter and said pick it up you paid for it (case pending against The claims of grocery financed by bush money)

(Doc. No. 1 at unnumbered 7) She adds, [b]ut it doesn't stop here[sic] I have to jump out from a false cab, attemptative [sic] of kidnaping and I heard from friends that the administration has contacted to let their message pass through, if I continue to speak to democrats and John Kerry people they will kidnap me and torture me this is ridiculous.

(Id). Clearly, Plaintiff has failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

Defendants have also responded to Plaintiff's bizarre filings by raising the issues of standing, lack of proper service, lack of

personal jurisdiction, and the doctrine of sovereign immunity. We will address these issues. Defendants contend that Plaintiff lacks standing to bring claims against them. (Doc. No. 12 at 5) "Standing is a threshold jurisdictional requirement, derived from the case or controversy' language of Article III of the Constitution. Plaintiffs must have standing at all stags of the litigation..." *Pub. Interest Research Group of N.J., Inc. V Magnesium Elektron, Inc.*, 123 F 3d 111, 118 (3d Cir. 1997) (citations omitted). To establish the constitutional minimum requirements for standing, a plaintiff must demonstrate that : (1) she suffered an injury in fact which is (a) concrete and particularized and (b) actual or imminent, not conjectural or hypothetical; (2) there must be a causal complaint between the injury and the conduct complained of, and (3) it must be likely as opposed to speculative that the injury will be redressed by a favorable decision. *Luyan v. Defenders of Wildlife,* 504 U.S. 555, 560-61 (1992). Defendants assert that Plaintiff's Complaint fails to satisfy these standing requirements. Defendants are correct.

From what we can discern from Plaintiff's rambling Complaint, the injuries she alleges are not particularized, but abstract and hypothetical. She does not demonstrate any injury in fact or any causal connection between Defendants' actions and her injuries. Plaintiff does not establish standing.

Defendants Bush and Rice also assert that Plaintiff's claims against them in their official capacity are barred by the doctrine of sovereign immunity. (Doc. No. 12 at 7). The doctrine of sovereign immunity provides that a plaintiff cannot bring a suit against the United States, including a suit for money damages,[2] except to the extent that the United States has expressly consented to be sued. *United States v. Mitchell*, 445 U.S. 535, 538 (1980). "A waiver of sovereign immunity cannot be implied but must be unequivocally expressed." *United States v. King* 395 U.S. 1,4

2Plaintiff appears to seek damages as follows:

just the money stolen from me 204 millions 87 cents, all the money I ve been rackitiered these past 4 years which an another 450,000 and some punitive damages for the pain and sufferance that they made me passed through, of course I survived an another 1 million a total of $205 millions 450 and 87 cents + (the money I invested in Texas, through advertising etc.. I brough income to Texas an another 6 millions and half.

(Doc. No. 1 at 3. (Original spelling and grammar.)

(1969). Plaintiff does not demonstrate a waiver of sovereign immunity which would permit suit against Defendants Bush and Rice in the official capacities.

Finally, Defendants Bush and Rice assert that Plaintiff failed to properly serve them. (Doc. No. 12 at 7.) In Plaintiff's Certification of Mailing, she states that she mailed the Complaint by regular mail to "Condelezza rice/georges w. bush." (Doc. No. 1 at 10.) Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4 (I) provides that Service upon the United States may be effected:

> (A) by delivering a copy of the summons and complaint to the United States attorney for the district in which the action is brought or to an assistant United States attorney or clerical employee designated by the United States attorney in a writing filed with the clerk of the court of by sending a copy of the summons and of the complaint by registered or certified mail addressed to the civil process clerk at the office of the United States attorney and (B) by also sending a copy of the summons and the complaint by registered or certified mail to the Attorney General of the United States.

Fed. R. Civ. P.4 (i)(1). Service upon an officer or agency of the United States "sued only in an official capacity...is effected by

serving the United States in the manner prescribed by Rule 4 (j)(1) and by also sending a copy of the summons and complaint by registered or certified mail to the officer, employee, agency or corporation." Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (I) (2)(A). Plaintiff has not properly served defendants Bush and Rice.

Defendants Rick Perry also asserts that Plaintiff has no personal jurisdiction over him. (Doc. No. 6 at 3.) Defendants Perry asserts that he is a non-resident and does not have sufficient contacts with Pennsylvania to satisfy jurisdictional requirements. (*Id.* At 4.) He contends that jurisdiction is not proper because Defendant does not have any contact with Pennsylvania *Id.* At 5.) Defendant Perry also asserts that all of the acts complained of by the Plaintiff regarding Perry result from actions taken by Plaintiff in Pennsylvania and do not involve any action taken by Perry in Pennsylvania. In *International Shoe Co. V. Washington,* 326U.S. 310, 316 (1954), the Supreme Court held that a non-resident defendant must have "purposely availed" itself of the benefits and protevcctins of the forum state by having established minimum

contacts such that the "maintenance of the suit does not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice" *Id.* (citations omitted). Those "minimum contacts" must be the basis for the plaintiff's claim *Helicopteros Nacionales De Columbia v. Hall*, 466 U.S. 408, 414 (1984). "A relationship a Among the defendant, the forum, and the litigations the essential foundation of in personam jurisdiction." *Id.* (citation omitted). *Id.* (Citation omitted). Under the "minimum contacts" requirement set out in *International Shoe*, personal jurisdiction may be established by contacts between a defendant and forum state that have been "continuous and systematic" or through "the commission of some single or occasional acts...in a state sufficient to impose an obligation or liability." *International Shoe Co.*, 326 U.S. at 317-18. We discern no contacts between Defendant Perry and Pennsylvania.

For the foregoing reasons, we grant Defendants' Motions to Dismiss and dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint.

An appropriate Order follows:

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

SOLANGE CHADDA	:	
	:	CIVIL ACTION
v.	:	
	:	NO. 04-CV-4207
ED GILLESPIE, ET AL.	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 24th daty of February, 2005, upon consideration of Defendant Rick Perry's Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 6); (2) Plaintiff Solange Chadda's Motion to Strike in response

(Doc. No. 10); (3) Defendants Condoleezza Rice and George W. Bush's Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 12); and (4) Planitiff's Motion to Strike in response (Doc. No. 13), it is ORDERED as follows:

(1) Defendant Rick Perry's Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 6) is GRANTED;

(2) Defendants Condoleezza Rice and George W. Bush's

Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 12) is GRANTED;

(3) Plaintiff's Complaint (Doc. No. 1) and Plaintiff's two Amended

Complaints (Doc. Nos. 8, 14) are DISMISSED.

The Clerk is directed to mark this case closed.

BY THE COURT:

_____

R. Barclay Surrick, Judge

App. 21

Supreme Court of the United States
Office of the Clerk
Washington, DC 20543-0001

William K. Suter
Clerk of the Court
(202) 479-3011

February 20, 2007

Ms. Solange Chadda
408 South 47th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19143

Re: Solange Chadda
v. Ed Gillespie, et al.
No. 06-518

Dear Ms. Chadda:

The Court today entered the following order in the above-entitled case.

The petition for a writ of ceriorari is denied.

Sincerely,

William K. Suter, Clerk

CASE STATUS AS OF MARCH 16, 2007

Plaintiff	United State Court of Appeals Third Circuit Docket No.	Disposition
Solange Chadda v. Ed Gillespsie, Condelezza Rice, Pr. Georges W. Bush et al	Case No. 05-1940	Petition for rehearin is denied
Solange Chadda v. Ed Gillespsie, Condelezza Rice, Pr. Georges W. Bush et al	Case No. 05-1940	Appeal dismissed
Solange Chadda v. Ed Gillespsie, et al	Case No. 04-4207	Complaints Dismisse
Solange Chadda v. Ed Gillespsie et al	Case No. 04-4207	Opinion
Solange Chadda v. Ed Gillespsie, et al	Case No. 04-CV-4207	Memorandum & Order
Solange Chadda v. Ed Gillespsie, et al	Case No. 04-CV-4207	Complaints Dismisse
Solange Chadda v. Ed Gillespsie, et al	Supreme Court of the United States Case No. 60-518	Petition for a writ of Certiorari denied

CERTIFICATE UNDER OATH

I, Solange Chadda declares under oath that the petition for rehearing is presented in good faith and not for the delay. It is very crucial that I state in front of This Court, that the grounds were not presented previously:

1. the violation under oath from the executive branch and its commander in chief and staff, needs immediate attention for the judiciary committee and the Supreme Court to act for the impeachment process

2. lying under oath to the American people and congress and the senate, needs immediate attention in the seeking of justice

3. obstruct the justice to the American people and congress and senate through the connection of the executive branch and the judiciary branch is a felony and this Court should oblige the parties to answer the petition. An Extraordinary Motion is on the way to be filed to that matter

4. every party should not use the fifth or any privilege to avoid answering to the petition for rehearing.

The Supreme Court of the United States should force the parties to answer all the briefs and the questions necessary in the view of justice to try to avoid the impeachment process, if possible.

The first petition didn't see the light because the defendants appellees refused to answer any brief and the court didn't oblige to do so.

A special motion will be filed with this Court to demand an answer from the commander in chief and his attorney, and from the other members of his administration and his attorneys and not to avoid more obstruction of justice in a matter of client and privilege running around.

This petition needs all the attention, because our constitution and its rights got violated. Because of the abuse of power and not the distinction between the executive, the legislative and the judiciary, cover up in one branch which is lying in our principles of our constitution and defrauding all the American people and congress and senate of the truth, leading only corruption, abuse of power, manipulation of funds and manipulation of justice to exceed no matter what, even if the American people, congress and senate has to suffer and pay the price of it.

If this Court doesn't push for the truth, the justice system will be a laugh of the judiciary committee and I am sure they will proceed right away to the impeachment process and rules of laws to that effect will change and change to the Constitution and its boundaries will be amended no matter what and no more chief of justice will violate the laws to their benefits.

This petition needs to be heard and this court needs to oblige the other side to respond and make briefs no matter what in the interest of justice.(Tom Delay, Condelezza Rice Gov Perry, and The President and his chief of staff, and others including the

Attorneys Generals who have been fired)

This is true under oath

This declaration and this petition is to amend some clarifications and underlined new grounds which are presented in good faith and not for delay.

Solange Chadda
408 South 47th street
Philadelphia,pa 19143
March 4th 2007

Petitioner pro se

April 4th/07

Donna P. Kelly

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
NOTARIAL SEAL
DONNA P. KELLY, Notary Public
City of Philadelphia, Phila. County
My Commission Expires May 9, 2009

4/4/07